

Serial No. 10/052,370  
April 15, 2003  
Page 6 of 9

#### REMARKS

Claims 1- 20 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, Applicant AMENDS claim 1.

Applicant greatly appreciates the Examiner's indication that claims 15-20 are allowed.

Claims 1, 2 and 7-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Masanori et al. (EP 0 961 404). Claims 3-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Masanori et al. in view of Keiji (EP 0 735 671). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of claims 1-14.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite:

"A surface acoustic wave apparatus comprising:  
a surface acoustic wave device provided on a piezoelectric substrate, said surface acoustic wave device including at least one interdigital electrode, and **balanced signal terminals provided for at least one of an input side and an output side;**  
a multi-layered retaining substrate including external terminals for connecting the balanced signal terminals to an external device, said multi-layered retaining substrate being provided to retain said surface acoustic wave device such that the at least one interdigital electrode faces a surface of said multi-layered retaining substrate; and  
**an electrical circuit provided between layers of said multi-layered retaining substrate such that said electrical circuit is located between the balanced signal terminals and the external terminals so as to increase a balance degree between the balanced signal terminals."** (emphasis added)

Applicant's claim 1 recites the features of "balanced signal terminals provided for at least one of an input side and an output side" and "an electrical circuit provided between layers of said multi-layered retaining substrate such that said electrical circuit is located between the balanced signal terminals and the external terminals so as to increase a balance degree between the balanced signal terminals." With the improved features of claim 1, Applicant has been able to provide a SAW apparatus with an improved balance degree (see, for example, the first paragraph on page 7 of the Specification).

Serial No. 10/052,370

April 15, 2003

Page 7 of 9

Applicant agrees with the Examiner that Masanori et al. shows a SAW apparatus. However, Masanori et al. fails to teach or suggest the feature of "balanced signal terminals provided for at least one of an input side and an output side" as recited in Applicant's claim 1. Masanori et al. clearly shows in **Fig. 24C**, referenced by the Examiner, that both of the input and output sides include unbalanced signal terminals, **NOT** that at least one of the input and output sides is provided with balanced signal terminals as recited in Applicant's claim 1. The Examiner is reminded that an unbalanced signal terminal includes a single input/output terminal and a ground terminal, as clearly shown in **Fig. 24C** of Masanori et al. (e.g., an unbalanced terminal 20 and ground 185 at the input side, and an unbalanced terminal 46 and ground 185 at the output side), and that a balanced terminal includes two input/output terminals, as shown in the bottom portion of Applicant's **Fig. 18**. Thus, **Fig. 24C** of Masanori et al. clearly shows an unbalanced input/output terminal and a ground terminal at both of the input and output sides of the SAW apparatus of Masanori et al.

Further, contrary to the Examiner's allegation, Masanori et al. does not teach or suggest the features of "an electrical circuit provided between layers of said multi-layered retaining substrate such that said electrical circuit is located between the balanced signal terminals and the external terminals so as to increase a balance degree between the balanced signal terminals" as recited in Applicant's claim 1.

First, the Examiner has alleged **P2** of Masanori et al. is an electrical circuit. However, **P2** of Masanori et al. is a printed circuit board, **NOT** an electrical circuit as recited in Applicant's claim 1.

Second, the Examiner has alleged that elements **104** and **104C** of Masanori et al. constitute a multi-layer retaining substrate. However, **104C** of Masanori et al. is a plate with a W pattern **200**, **NOT** a multi-layer retaining substrate as recited in Applicant's claim 1.

Third, Masanori et al. teaches that W pattern **200** is located between the ground electrodes 410<sub>3</sub> or 410<sub>4</sub> and 410<sub>1</sub> and the external electrodes **113** and **116**, **NOT** an

Serial No. 10/052,370  
April 15, 2003  
Page 8 of 9

electrical circuit located between the balanced signal terminals and the external electrodes as recited in Applicant's claim 1.

Fourth, contrary to the Examiner's allegation, there is no hint or suggestion in Masanori et al. that the W pattern 200 improves the balance degree between the balanced signal terminals as recited in Applicant's claim 1. In fact, Masanori et al., col. 19, second paragraph, only teaches that the interference of the ground potential is effectively avoided by the W pattern 200.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Masanori.

Keiji is relied upon merely to teach an adjustor 23, and certainly fails to teach or suggest "balanced signal terminals provided for at least one of an input side and an output side" and "an electrical circuit provided between layers of said multi-layered retaining substrate such that said electrical circuit is located between the balanced signal terminals and the external terminals so as to increase a balance degree between the balanced signal terminals" as recited in the present claimed invention. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Keiji et al. fails to cure the deficiencies of Masanori et al. described above.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Masanori et al. and Keiji, applied alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the unique combination and arrangement of elements recited in claim 1 of the present application. Claims 2-14 depend upon claim 1, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons that claim 1 is allowable. Claims 15-20 are allowed, as indicated by the Examiner.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are solicited.

Serial No. 10/052,370  
April 15, 2003  
Page 9 of 9

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1353.

Date: April 15, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

  
Attorney for Applicant

Joseph R. Keating  
Registration No. 37,368

Christopher A. Bennett  
Registration No. 46,710

**KEATING & BENNETT LLP**  
10400 Eaton Place, Suite 312  
Fairfax, VA 22030  
Telephone: (703) 385-5200  
Facsimile: (703) 385-5080

**FAX RECEIVED**  
APR 15 2003  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800